



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,143	03/12/2004	Joel A. Barker	B377-029-PAT	6798

7590 07/16/2008
Angenehm Law Firm, Ltd.
P.O. Box 48755
Coon Rapids, MN 55448-0755

EXAMINER

RIFKIN, BEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2129

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/800,143	Applicant(s) BARKER, JOEL A.	
	Examiner Ben M. Rifkin	Art Unit 2129	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/14/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The instant application having Application No. 10800143 has a total of 21 claims pending in the application, all of which are ready for examination by the examiner.

I. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT

Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS was not considered for this reference because the examiner did not receive any of the noted books in the IDS.

II. REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART

Examiners Note: *Some rejections will be followed by an 'EN' that will denote an examiners note. This will be placed to further explain a rejection.*

1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Schreier** ("Thinking about Thinking") in view of **Heckerman** et al (US 6742003 B2).

As per **claim 1**, Schrier discloses, "A method of exploring: comprising the steps of: writing center text" (Pg.5, particularly the last paragraph; *EN: this denotes the implications wheel, and carefully defining the center issue.* Pg.6; *EN: This denotes a picture of the wheel*). "Displaying the center text in a center node" (Pg.6; *EN: This denotes a picture of a wheel, with "Train Length May increase by 50-100%" being the center node*). "Writing first order implications, each first order implication forming at least a part of an arc" (Pg. 6, particularly the figure on that page. Pg.5, particularly the figure; *EN: both these figures disclose first order implications tied to the center portion. Each is an "arc" in the sense that it is a broken up portion of the wheel as disclosed in the specification of the instant application*). "Displaying each first order implication in a first order node; Connecting each first order node to the center node; writing any desired child implications of any existing implications; displaying the child implications in child nodes; connecting the child nodes to an associated parent node to form a wheel;" (Pg.6, particularly the figure; *EN: this denotes first order nodes in the figure, their*

connections, and their children, all in their respective nodes).
However, Schrier fails to explicitly disclose, "Preparing and displaying a summary of the wheel including only those implications, together with any ancestor implications necessary to connect to the center text, that are both significant implications and match any user determined auxiliary summary parameters."

Heckerman discloses, "Preparing and displaying a summary of the wheel including only those implications, together with any ancestor implications necessary to connect to the center text, that are both significant implications and match any user determined auxiliary summary parameters" (C5, particularly L15-62; *EN: this denotes the user interacting with a user interface of a display of interrelationships among a cluster (a graph), and being able to select different levels of hierarchy and display different summaries based on what information they want to see).*

Schrier and Heckerman are analogous art because both involve graphical display of organized information.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of graphical display of organized information to combine the work of Schrier and Heckerman in order to allow

the display program to summarize information in the graph for the user.

The motivation for doing so would be to allow the user to "Browse through a hierarchy of displayed clusters, and, if desired, select individual clusters for comparison with each other." (Heckerman, C4, L35-49). Further, summarizing clearly has inherent benefits, making large amounts of information easy to read and understand.

Therefore at the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of graphical display of organized information to combine the work of Schrier and Heckerman in order to allow the display program to summarize information in the graph for the user.

As per claim 2, Heckerman discloses, "visually ...the wheel in a plane skewed to a plane defined by a monitor screen" (C5, particularly L43-53; *EN: this denotes the user browsing through the clusters, moving things around as they choose in order to see what data they wish to see*).

While Heckerman and Schrier do not explicitly disclose, "rotating" it would none-the-less be rendered obvious. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to rotate a graph as needed for the user to view since it was known in the art at the time that

rotating is a way to browse through a graph to see a particular portion a user is interested in.

As per **claim 3**, Heckerman discloses, "Wherein the wheel is rotated when any node is selected; the selected node is rotated to the foreground" (C5, particularly L43-53; *EN: this denotes the user browsing through the clusters, selecting what they wish to see*).

As per **claim 4**, Heckerman discloses, "Wherein the nodes forming the wheel are displayed in a diminished mode such that the implications within the node is not revealed" (C8, particularly L1-10; *EN: this denotes de-emphasizing the nodes (hiding) so that users can concentrate on more important nodes*).

As per **claim 5**, Heckerman discloses, "Fully displaying each node including revealing each implication within each node" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs; *EN: this denotes a graph showing all available nodes and their information*).

As per **claim 6**, Schrier discloses, "fully displaying a portion of the nodes, including revealing the implications within some of the nodes" (pg.6, particularly the figure; *EN: this denotes a graph with some nodes with information showing, some without information showing*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. **Claim 7** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Schreier ("Thinking about Thinking") and Heckerman et al (US 6742003 B2) in view of Amini (US 6581102 B1).

As per **claim 7**, Schrier discloses, "Scoring" (Pg.25, particularly the second to last paragraph; *EN: this denotes scoring being used in tandem with the Implication Wheel discussed throughout the paper*).

Heckerman Further defines "Scoring" (C5, particularly L21-33; *EN: this denotes scoring the various clusters in the graph*).

Neither Schrier nor Heckerman explicitly discloses, "Electronically distributing" or Encrypting data associated with one arc."

Amini discloses, "electronically distributing" or Encrypting data associated with one arc." (C20, particularly L24-37; *EN: This denotes electronically distributing information using encryption to protect that information*).

Schrier, Heckerman and Amini are analogous art because they all involve electronic information.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of electronic information to combine the work of the combination of Schrier and Heckerman, with Amini in order

to use encryption to protect information while it is being transferred.

The motivation for doing so would be to make sure information "being transmitted over the public network is secured" (Amini, C20, L23-38).

Therefore at the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of electronic information to combine the combination of Schrier, Heckerman, and Amini in order to use encryption to protect information while it is being transferred.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. **Claims 8-13 and 15-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreier ("Thinking about Thinking") in view of Bollacker et al (US 20050049986 A1).

As per **claim 8**, Schreier discloses, "A method of exploring: comprising the steps of: writing center text" (Pg.5, particularly the last paragraph; *EN: this denotes the implications wheel, and carefully defining the center issue.* Pg.6; *EN: This denotes a picture of the wheel*). "Displaying the center text in a center node" (Pg.6; *EN: This denotes a picture of a wheel, with "Train Length May increase by 50-100%" being the center node*). "Writing first order implications, each first order implication forming at least a part of an arc" (Pg. 6,

particularly the figure on that page. Pg.5, particularly the figure; *EN: both these figures disclose first order implications tied to the center portion. Each is an "arc" in the sense that it is a broken up portion of the wheel as disclosed in the specification of the instant application*). "Displaying each first order implication in a first order node; Connecting each first order node to the center node; writing any desired child implications of any existing implications; displaying the child implications in child nodes; connecting the child nodes to an associated parent node to form a wheel;" (Pg.6, particularly the figure; *EN: this denotes first order nodes in the figure, their connections, and their children, all in their respective nodes*). Schrier defines "scoring" (C5, particularly L21-33; *EN: this denotes scoring the various clusters in the graph*). However, Schrier fails to explicitly disclose, "Scoring the implications according to at least two view points; and preparing and displaying a conflict summary wheel including only those implications, together with any ancestor implications necessary to connect to the center text, that both are significant implications and received a conflicting score between at least two different view points."

Bollacker discloses, "Scoring the implications according to at least two view points" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs,

particularly paragraphs 0047-0052; *EN: this denotes taking information from numerous sources (view points) as seen in Figure 4, and using them to make predictions, as well as scoring the various pieces with confidence and influence values, determining how important/likely/correct a source of information is*). "Preparing and displaying a conflict summary wheel including only those implications, together with any ancestor implications necessary to connect to the center text, that both are significant implications and received a conflicting score between at least two different viewpoints" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 0047-0052 and paragraphs 0042-0046; *EN: this denotes a structured argument as seen in figure 4. It further includes the ability to edit, hide, zoom, and manipulate the argument (or in this case, the wheel disclosed by Schrier) to show what the user wishes to see. It clearly includes numerous view points (as shown by the various different information coming to the conclusion shown in Figure 4) and this includes viewpoints that add or detract to the conclusion at the top of the graph, providing conflicting viewpoints*).

Schrier and Bollacker are analogous art because both involve graphical display of organized information and decision making.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of graphical display of organized information and decision making to combine the work of Schrier and Bollacker in order to allow the display program to summarize information in a manner easy to understand and allow multiple view points to be used within the process.

The motivation for doing so would be to allow the user to "Filter and organize the received information into a useful form" (Bollacker, Paragraph 0002) and "allow a user to immediately see the impact of any change of reasoning" (Bollacker, paragraph 0024).

Therefore at the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of graphical display of organized information and decision making to combine the work of Schrier and Bollacker in order to allow the display program to allow the display program to summarize information in a manner easy to understand and allow multiple view points to be used within the process.

As per **claim 9**, Bollacker discloses, "visually ... the conflict summary wheel in a plane skewed to a plane defined by a monitor screen" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 0047-0052 and paragraphs 0042-0046; *EN: this denotes a structured argument as seen in figure 4. It further includes*

the ability to edit, hide, zoom, and manipulate the argument (or in this case, the wheel disclosed by Schrier) to show what the user wishes to see).

While Schrier and Bollacker do not explicitly disclose, "rotating" it would none-the-less be rendered obvious. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to rotate a graph as needed for the user to view since it was known in the art at the time that rotating is a way to browse through a graph to see a particular portion a user is interested in.

As per **claim 10**, Bollacker discloses, "Wherein the wheel is ... when a node is selected, the selected node being rotated to the foreground" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 0047-0052 and paragraphs 0042-0046; *EN: this denotes a structured argument as seen in figure 4. It further includes the ability to edit, hide, zoom, and manipulate the argument (or in this case, the wheel disclosed by Schrier) to show what the user wishes to see. pg.3, particularly paragraph 0033; EN: this denotes using various methods to display information, including color changes, font changes, thickness changes, and other methods of displaying information).*

While Schrier and Bollacker do not explicitly disclose, "rotating" it would none-the-less be rendered obvious. It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to rotate a graph as needed for the user to view since it was known in the art at the time that rotating is a way to browse through a graph to see a particular portion a user is interested in.

As per **claim 11**, Bollacker discloses, "Wherein the node forming the wheel are displayed in a diminished mode such that the implication within the node is not revealed" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 0047-0052 and paragraphs 0042-0046; *EN: this denotes a structured argument as seen in figure 4. It further includes the ability to edit, hide, zoom, and manipulate the argument (or in this case, the wheel disclosed by Schrier) to show what the user wishes to see. pg.3, particularly paragraph 0033; EN: this denotes using various methods to display information, including color changes, font changes, thickness changes, and other methods of displaying information).*

As per **claim 12**, Bollacker discloses, "fully displaying each node including revealing each implication within each node" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 0047-0052 and paragraphs 0042-0046; *EN: this denotes a structured argument as seen in figure 4. It further includes the ability to edit, hide, zoom, and manipulate the argument (or in this case,*

the wheel disclosed by Schrier) to show what the user wishes to see. pg.3, particularly paragraph 0033; EN: this denotes using various methods to display information, including color changes, font changes, thickness changes, and other methods of displaying information).

As per **claim 13**, Bollacker discloses, "fully displaying a portion of the nodes, including revealing the implications within some of the nodes" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 0047-0052 and paragraphs 0042-0046; *EN: this denotes a structured argument as seen in figure 4. It further includes the ability to edit, hide, zoom, and manipulate the argument (or in this case, the wheel disclosed by Schrier) to show what the user wishes to see. pg.3, particularly paragraph 0033; EN: this denotes using various methods to display information, including color changes, font changes, thickness changes, and other methods of displaying information).*

As per **claim 15**, Schrier discloses, "A method of exploring: comprising the steps of: writing center text" (Pg.5, particularly the last paragraph; *EN: this denotes the implications wheel, and carefully defining the center issue. Pg.6; EN: This denotes a picture of the wheel).* "Displaying the center text in a center node" (Pg.6; *EN: This denotes a picture of a wheel, with "Train Length May increase by 50-100%" being*

the center node). "Writing first order implications, each first order implication forming at least a part of an arc" (Pg. 6, particularly the figure on that page. Pg.5, particularly the figure; *EN: both these figures disclose first order implications tied to the center portion. Each is an "arc" in the sense that it is a broken up portion of the wheel as disclosed in the specification of the instant application*). "Displaying each first order implication in a first order node; Connecting each first order node to the center node; writing any desired child implications of any existing implications; displaying the child implications in child nodes; connecting the child nodes to an associated parent node to form a wheel;" (Pg.6, particularly the figure; *EN: this denotes first order nodes in the figure, their connections, and their children, all in their respective nodes*). However, Schrier fails to explicitly disclose, "randomly selecting any node of any order to be scored by clicking on the node; scoring the selected node as to significance and likelihood; and visually removing indicia designating a node as non-scored and marking the node as scored once the node is scored, such marking being positionable inside the node, on the line defining the node and outside the node."

Bollacker discloses, "Randomly selecting any node of any order to be scored by clicking on the node" (Pg.4, particularly

paragraph 0045; *EN: this denotes the user altering the nodes and allowing the changed values to propagate through the network, or to halt their propagation through the network as needed by the user. This discloses the user interacting with a node to score the node*). "Scoring the selected node as to significance and likelihood" (Pg.7, particularly paragraph 0074; *EN: this denotes scoring nodes with a confidence value (likelihood) and an influence value (significance)*). "Visually removing indicia designating a node as non-scored and marking the node as scored once the node is scored, such marking being positionable inside the node, on the line defining the node and outside the node" (Pg.7, particularly paragraph 0073; *EN: this denotes the user scoring the node, and identifying that it is scored in various ways, including changing the appearance of the node or using a numerical indicator*).

Schrier and Bollacker are analogous art because both involve graphical display of organized information and decision making.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of graphical display of organized information and decision making to combine the work of Schrier and Bollacker in order to allow the display program to allow the user to

interact with the graph in order to score nodes with various methods and use various visual indicia of scores for the graph.

The motivation for doing so would be to allow the user to "Filter and organize the received information into a useful form" (Bollacker, Paragraph 0002) and "allow a user to immediately see the impact of any change of reasoning" (Bollacker, paragraph 0024).

Therefore at the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of graphical display of organized information and decision making to combine the work of Schrier and Bollacker in order to allow the display program to allow the display program to allow the user to interact with the graph in order to score nodes with various methods and use various visual indicia of scores for the graph.

As per **claim 16**, Bollacker further discloses, "coloring the inside of the node; and changing the color of text within the node" (pg.3, particularly paragraph 0033; *EN: this denotes using various methods to display information, including color changes, font changes, thickness changes, and other methods of displaying information*).

As per **claim 17**, Schrier discloses, "Distrusting arcs for completion and scoring; and combining completed and scored arcs into a wheel" (Pg.6, particularly the second figure; *EN: this*

denotes building up the implications wheel using arcs and displaying the information). Schrier discloses, "Scoring" (pg.25, particularly the second to last paragraph; *EN: this denotes scoring the implications wheel).*

Bollacker further defines "scoring" (Pg.7, particularly paragraph 0074; *EN: this denotes scoring nodes with a confidence value (likelihood) and an influence value (significance)).*

As per **claim 18**, Bollacker discloses, "visually ... the wheel in a plane skewed to a plane defined by a monitor screen" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 0047-0052 and paragraphs 0042-0046; *EN: this denotes a structured argument as seen in figure 4. It further includes the ability to edit, hide, zoom, and manipulate the argument (or in this case, the wheel disclosed by Schrier) to show what the user wishes to see).*

While Schrier and Bollacker do not explicitly disclose, "rotating" it would none-the-less be rendered obvious. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to rotate a graph as needed for the user to view since it was known in the art at the time that rotating is a way to browse through a graph to see a particular portion a user is interested in.

As per **claim 19**, Bollacker discloses, "Wherein the wheel is rotated when a node is selected; the selected node being rotated to the foreground" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 0047-0052 and paragraphs 0042-0046; *EN: this denotes a structured argument as seen in figure 4. It further includes the ability to edit, hide, zoom, and manipulate the argument (or in this case, the wheel disclosed by Schrier) to show what the user wishes to see).*

As per **claim 20**, Bollacker discloses, "Wherein the nodes forming the wheel are displayed in a diminished mode such that the implication within the node is not revealed" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 0047-0052 and paragraphs 0042-0046; *EN: this denotes a structured argument as seen in figure 4. It further includes the ability to edit, hide, zoom, and manipulate the argument (or in this case, the wheel disclosed by Schrier) to show what the user wishes to see pg.3, particularly paragraph 0033; EN: this denotes using various methods to display information, including color changes, font changes, thickness changes, and other methods of displaying information).*

As per **claim 21**, Bollacker discloses, "Fully displaying a portion of the nodes, including revealing the implications within some of the nodes" pg.3, particularly paragraph 0033; *EN:*

this denotes using various methods to display information, including color changes, font changes, thickness changes, and other methods of displaying information pg.3, particularly paragraph 0033; EN: this denotes using various methods to display information, including color changes, font changes, thickness changes, and other methods of displaying information).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. **Claim 14** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Schreier ("Thinking about Thinking") and Bollacker et al (US 2005004996 A1) in view of Amini (US 6581102 B1).

As per **claim 7**, Schrier discloses, "Scoring" (Pg.25, particularly the second to last paragraph; *EN: this denotes scoring being used in tandem with the Implication Wheel discussed throughout the paper*).

Bollacker Further defines "Scoring" (Fig. 4 and associated paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 0047-0052; *EN: this denotes taking information from numerous sources (view points) as seen in Figure 4, and using them to make predictions, as well as scoring the various pieces with confidence and influence values, determining how important/likely/correct a source of information is*).

Neither Schrier nor Bollacker explicitly discloses, "Electronically distributing" or Encrypting data associated with one arc."

Amini discloses, "electronically distributing" or Encrypting data associated with one arc." (C20, particularly L24-37; *EN: This denotes electronically distributing information using encryption to protect that information*).

Schreier, Bollacker and Amini are analogous art because they all involve electronic information.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of electronic information to combine the work of the combination of Schrier and Bollacker, with Amini in order to use encryption to protect information while it is being transferred.

The motivation for doing so would be to make sure information "being transmitted over the public network is secured" (Amini, C20, L23-38).

Therefore at the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art of electronic information to combine the combination of Schrier, Bollacker, and Amini in order to use encryption to protect information while it is being transferred.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Conclusion

The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line no(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application.

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ben M. Rifkin whose telephone number is (571) 272-9768. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 AM-6:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Vincent can be reached on (571) 272-3080. The fax phone number for the

Art Unit: 2129

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

June 9, 2008

Ben Rifkin
Examiner
Art Unit 2129

/David R Vincent/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2129